

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Deciem Beauty Group Inc. v. Zsolt Bikadi
Case No. D2026-1149

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Deciem Beauty Group Inc., Canada, represented by Gowling WLG (Canada) LLP, Canada.

The Respondent is Zsolt Bikadi, Hungary, self-represented.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <theordinary.live> is registered with Domain Science Kutatási Szolgáltató Korlátolt Felelősségű Társaság (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 17, 2026. On March 18, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 19, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response, disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name which differed from the named Respondent (Redacted For Privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 20, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on March 20, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Policy” or “UDRP”), the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Rules”), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Supplemental Rules”).

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on March 25, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 14, 2026. The Response was filed with the Center on April 10, 2026.

The Center appointed Kaya Köklü as the sole panelist in this matter on April 22, 2026. The Panel finds that it was properly constituted. The Panel has submitted the Statement of Acceptance and Declaration of Impartiality and Independence, as required by the Center to ensure compliance with the Rules, paragraph 7.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is a global skincare and beauty company with its registered seat in Canada. Since its launch in 2013, it has developed more than 50 products that are sold in markets around the world.

The Complainant owns THE ORDINARY trademark, which is registered in many jurisdictions. According to the Complaint, the Complainant is, among many others, the owner of the European Union Trademark Registration No. 015761182, registered on December 8, 2016, for THE ORDINARY, covering protection for mainly beauty and skin care products as protected in class 3.

The Complainant operates its official website at the domain name <theordinary.com>.

The Respondent is reportedly located in Hungary and has apparently been involved in numerous other UDRP disputes as a respondent before, all of them decided against the Respondent. For instance, see *BGC Group, Inc., and BGC Partners, L.P. v. Zsolt Bikadi*, WIPO Case No. [D2026-0006](#); *Opice Blum Academy Treinamento e Consultoria Ltda v. Zsolt Bikadi*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-2311](#), or *H. Lundbeck A/S v. Zsolt Bikadi*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-1306](#).

The disputed domain name was registered on September 27, 2025.

Based on information and screenshots provided by the Complainant, the disputed domain name redirected to the website of a sales platform, where the disputed domain name was offered for sale at a price of USD 100.

At the time of this Decision, the disputed domain name no longer resolves to an active website.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

In its amendment to the Complaint, the Complainant additionally argues that the Respondent has been engaged in a pattern of bad faith conduct by registering a significant number of domain names that contain third-party trademarks in order to prevent trademark owners from reflecting their marks in corresponding domain names.

B. Respondent

The Respondent contends that the Complainant has not satisfied the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

In his Response, the Respondent mainly argues that he did not target the Complainant and it's THE ORDINARY trademark. Rather, the Respondent argues that the disputed domain name consists of two generic English terms creating a dictionary word string, and that the Respondent's registration was based on the generic value of the terms. This is in view of the Respondent particularly evidenced by the USD 100 asking price for the disputed domain name.

Furthermore, the Respondent argues that the Complainant's alleged pattern of bad faith is unfounded. The Respondent is rather of the opinion that holding a large portfolio of descriptive domain names is a legitimate business activity, not a "pattern of bad faith". In addition, the Respondent argues that in a large portfolio, occasional disputes are a statistical inevitability.

In light of the above, the Respondent is of the opinion that this case rather appears to be a classic case of Reverse Domain Name Hijacking.

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 15(a) of the Rules, the Panel shall decide the Complaint in accordance with the Policy, the Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable.

In accordance with paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that each of the three following elements is satisfied:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

It is noted that the Panel has taken note of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)") and, where appropriate, will decide consistently with the consensus views captured therein.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

It is well accepted that the first element functions primarily as a standing requirement. The standing (or threshold) test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of the THE ORDINARY trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name without any additions. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the THE ORDINARY mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which the Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognized that proving that a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the difficult task of "proving a negative", requiring information that is often primarily within the knowledge or control of the respondent. As such, where a complainant makes out a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to the respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name (although the burden of proof always remains on the complainant). If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant

evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Respondent asserts that the disputed domain name consists of two common dictionary terms in the English language and that it was registered on account of its allegedly generic value. However, it is well established that the mere fact that a domain name is composed of dictionary terms does not, by itself, confer rights or legitimate interests under the Policy. Mere arguments that a domain name corresponds to a dictionary term/phrase or unique/catchy or memorable term (sometimes referred to by respondents as “brandable”) may not be sufficient, and panels will consider the overall facts and circumstances of the case when assessing such arguments. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.10.

In the present case, the Respondent has provided no evidence of any bona fide offering of goods or services, nor any demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name in a manner consistent with the dictionary meaning of the terms “the” and “ordinary”. The Panel notes the Respondent’s assertion that the disputed domain name as a combination of dictionary terms might be appealing to a variety of users, and that aggregating and holding for resale domain names consisting of dictionary words or common phrases can be bona fide and is not per se illegitimate under the Policy. The Panel further notes, however, that the Respondent’s own examples of such potential uses unrelated to the Complainant involve a combination of “the ordinary” and some additional terms (“life in the ordinary” and “beyond the ordinary”), whereas the disputed domain name consists merely of the definite article “the” and the adjective “ordinary” which, as combined, are the Complainant’s registered trademark. The Panel takes the view that the disputed domain name has rather been selected to take advantage of its significance as a trademark owned by the Complainant, considering also that the Respondent has repeatedly registered third-party trademarks as domain names.

In these circumstances, the Panel finds that the Respondent has failed to rebut the Complainant’s prima facie case.

Consequently, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel notes that, for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, paragraph 4(b) of the Policy establishes circumstances, in particular, but without limitation, that, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent’s registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent contends that the disputed domain name was registered solely because it consists of two dictionary English terms. While this may in principle be a plausible explanation in certain cases, the Panel does not find it credible in the present circumstances, for the following reasons.

First, as noted above, although the terms “the” and “ordinary” are dictionary words, their combination corresponds exactly to the Complainant’s trademark THE ORDINARY, which is used in connection with widely marketed beauty and skin care products since many years. The Panel considers that this particular combination of dictionary terms is not a combination that would naturally be selected for its descriptive value alone, as it does not convey an obvious generic or commercial meaning.

Second, the record indicates that the Respondent has been involved in multiple prior UDRP proceedings in which it registered domain names corresponding to third-party trademarks, including inherently distinctive trademarks that do not consist of dictionary words. Notably, in all of the cited cases, UDRP panels have expressly confirmed the Respondent's bad faith. This pattern of conduct is another indicator that the Respondent engages in the systematic registration of domain names targeting the marks of others.

In light of this pattern, the Panel believes that the Respondent's explanation of its registration of the disputed domain name is not credible. On the balance of probabilities, the Panel rather finds that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's trademark at the time of registration and selected the disputed domain name because of its association with the THE ORDINARY mark.

With respect to bad faith use, the Panel notes that the disputed domain name has been passively held and offered for sale for a sum of around USD 100.

While a relatively low asking price does not, in itself, establish bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy, it does also not preclude a finding of bad faith where other indicia are present. In particular, where a respondent has targeted the Complainant's mark and, more broadly, engaged in a pattern of abusive registrations of domain names corresponding to third-party trademarks in bad faith, even a modest sales offer may be part of a broader abusive practice.

Moreover, panels have consistently held that passive holding can constitute bad faith use where the totality of the circumstances indicates that the respondent's conduct is abusive.

In the present case, the Panel again notes the identity of the disputed domain name with the Complainant's THE ORDINARY trademark, and the Respondent's pattern of registering domain names corresponding to third-party marks.

Taken together, all these circumstances support a finding that the Respondent's previous offer for sale and current passive holding of the disputed domain name constitute bad faith use.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraphs 4(i) of the Policy and 15 of the Rules, the Panel orders that the disputed domain name <theordinary.live> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Kaya Köklü/

Kaya Köklü

Sole Panelist

Date: May 6, 2026